



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,175	11/09/2001	James R. Doran	END920010073US1	6793

7590

09/28/2005

John R. Pivnichny, Ph.D.
IBM Corporation, N50/040-4
1701 North Street
Endicott, NY 13760

EXAMINER

TRUONG, LECHI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2194

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/037,175

Applicant(s)

DORAN ET AL.

Examiner

LeChi Truong

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-22 are presented for the examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-11, 13, 15, 16-18, 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirkwood et al (US. Patent 6,665,662 B1) in view of Lippert et al (US. Patent 6,356,906 B1).

3. As to claim 1, Kirkwood teaches the application substantially as claimed including: a data store having a plurality of entries (relational database to store the concepts, page 12, ln 52-55/ the concept database 420, col 19, ln 8-11), a server server (web server 402, col 21, ln 40-42/ Fig. 4 A), a API couple to said data stored (col 21, ln 40- 42 and ln 54-55/ col 22, ln 5-10), sending a query to data store (col 2, ln 45-48/col 36, ln 33-37), receiving a entry (col 21, ln 53-59), a wrapper (server side adapter 460, col 21, ln 50-53/ col 22 , ln 5-10), a wrapper coupled to said API for accepting request from a user interface(col 21, ln 50-55, fig. 4B/ col 22 , ln 3-8), directory for the database (hierarchical trees in the concept database 420, col 22, and ln 47-49).

Kirkwood does not explicit teach a wrapper is adapted for accepting query in a plurality of programming languages. However, Lippert teaches a wrapper is adapted for accepting query

Art Unit: 2194

in a plurality of programming languages (a predetermined query language such as SQL. The method wraps the query according to a predetermined markup language, such as XML, col 2, ln 26-30/ col 5, ln 63-67/ other constructs and adaptations can be used to adapt SQL to XML, or any other database query language to any other markup language, col 10, ln 20-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Kirkwood and Lippert because Lippert's a wrapper is adapted for accepting query in a plurality of programming languages would improve the efficiency of Kirkwood's system by allowing the client to formulate queries to obtain information from databases stored on servers.

4. **As to claim 2**, Kirkwood teaches a relational database (col 12, ln 50-52).
5. **As to claim 4**, Kirkwood teaches a plurality of API coupled to said data store, each API adapted to send said query to said data store and receive one of said plurality of directory entries (col 17, ln 57-60/ Fig. 4 A).
6. **As to claim 5**, Kirkwood teaches a plurality of wrapper each said wrapper coupled to one or more of said API (col 21, ln 50-55, fig. 4B/ col 22, ln 3-8).
7. **As to claim 7**, Kirkwood teaches API is adapted to receive one of said plurality of directory entries from said data store and send said one of the directory entries to said user application (col 18, ln 21-25).
8. **As to claim 8**, Kirkwood teaches API is adapted to send said one of said directory entries to said user application through said wrapper (col 21, ln 51-55/ col 22, ln 3-10).
9. **As to claim 9**, Kirkwood teaches API is adapted to receive said one of said plurality of directory entries in response to said query (col 21, ln 53-56).

Art Unit: 2194

10. As to **claim 10**, it is an apparatus claim of claims 1 and 7; therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 7 above.

11. As to **claims 11, 13, 15**, they are apparatus claims of claims 2, 4, 5; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2, 4, 5 above.

12. As to **claim 16**, Kirkwood teaches receiving one of said plurality of entries from said data stored and sending said one of said entries to said user application (col 21, ln 51-55/ col 22, ln 3-10).

13. As to **claims 17, 18**, they are an apparatus claims of claim 8, 10; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 8, 10 above.

14. As to **claim 20**, it is an apparatus claim of claim 10; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 10 above. In additional, Kirkwood teaches program instruction (software program, col 5, ln 5-6).

15. As to **claim 21**, it is an apparatus claim of claim 8; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 8 above.

16. As to **claim 22**, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above. In additional, Kirkwood teaches service capable of serving up web pages (col 1, ln 54-57).

17. Claims **3, 12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirkwood et al (US. 6,665,662 B1) in view of Lippert et al (US. Patent 6,356,906 B1), as applied to claim 1 above, and further view of Kumar et al (US. Patent 6,343,287 B1).

Art Unit: 2194

18. As to claim 3, Kirkwood, Lippert do not teach an LDAP data store. However, Kirkwood teaches LDAP (LDAP, Fig. 3).

19. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Kirkwood, Lippert and Kumar because Kumar's LDAP would improve the flexibility of Kumar and Lippert's systems by allowing user to initiate a search for the requesting from the user.

20. As to claim 12, it is an apparatus claim of claim 3; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 3 above.

21. Claims **6, 14, 19,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirkwood et al (US. 6,665,662 B1) in view of Lippert et al (US. Patent 6,356,906 B1), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Coden et al (US. Patent 5,873,080).

22. As to claim 6, Kirkwood, Lippert do not teach an API locator on said web server for selecting one of said plurality of API in response to said query. However, Coden teaches an API locator on said web server for selecting one of said plurality of API in response to said query (each query object (col 12-ln 17-22), contained in the combined query 110 is directed by the query interface 130 to one ore more engines by calls to that engine's application programming interface (API) (152, 154, 156) respectively, col 6, ln 46-51/ ln 60-66).

23. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Kirkwood, Lippert and Coden because Coden's an API locator on said web server for selecting one of said plurality of API in response to said query

Art Unit: 2194

would increase the efficiency of Kirkwood and Lippert's systems by allowing relevant documents to be able to specify conditions on the content.

24. As to claims 14, 19, they are apparatus claims of claim 6; therefore, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 6 above.

Response to the argument

25. Applicant's arguments filed 02/22/2005 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant amended the claims. Lippert 's reference meets the amended claims.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2194

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (703) 305 5312. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 703-305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

LeChi Truong

September 22, 2005


MENG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100